

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 15-23. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 15-23 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant has amended the claim to correct the claiming language.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 15-17, 19-21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pilkington et al (hereinafter Pilkington) (WO 01/78351A2) in view of Lennie et al (hereinafter Lennie) (US 6,836,845B1). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Pilkington reference is cited for teaching storing a cookie related to a client in a proxy server. The Detailed Action states that a cookie is stored in the proxy server (Fig. 7, element "set Cookie" in Gateway 55, Fig. 9, element 914-Valid set/reset cookie"). The Lennie reference is cited for teaching AAS server address in a cookie generating a cookie that includes the AAS address (Col. 10, line 1-5) and sending the cookie to the client system (Fig. 6).

In Pilkington, Fig. 7 refers to Gateway 55 and web proxy 57 in Fig. 5. In Fig. 5, Web Proxy 57 is positioned between the Firewall and Gateway 55. In Figure 9, Gateway 85 is referenced in Figure 8. Gateway 85 is positioned between the firewall and web proxy 87. It is obvious from both Figures that Pilkington intended that the web proxy be a different node from the gateway.

As stated in the Pilkington reference (page 9, 4th paragraph) and similarly in the Detailed Action, "The gateway server 55 holds ... cookies, which have been set by the

application servers." The difference between the Pilkington reference and the Detailed action is that Pilkington states the gateway server (labeled 55 and 85 in Fig. 5 and 8) and the proxy server (labeled 57 and 87 in Fig. 5 and 8) are different, but the Detailed Action equates the gateway server with the proxy server when storing the cookie. The web proxy and gateway servers are not the same node in Pilkington.

In the Lennie reference, the generated cookie is sent to the client system, not to the proxy server as disclosed in the Applicant's present invention. The Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to amended Claim 15.

15. (Currently Amended) A method for providing access to information related to a client terminal to a first web server, the information being stored by a second web server, wherein the first web server is connected to the client terminal via a proxy server, the method comprising the steps of:
the second web server sending a message, including a cookie, to the proxy server, wherein the cookie comprises a network address of the second web server;
storing the cookie in said proxy server, the cookie being related to the client terminal;
the proxy server receiving a message from said client terminal that is addressed to the first web server;
the proxy server inserting the cookie into the received message, said cookie identifying said second web server; and
forwarding the received message to the first web server wherein said first web server uses said cookie for requesting said information from said second web server. (emphasis added)

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Pilkington and Lennie fails to render independent claim 15 unpatentable for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose the second web server sending a cookie containing the second web server address to the proxy server. Pilkington teaches storing a cookie in a gateway server not the proxy server. This step is neither taught nor suggested by Pilkington and Lennie. In the Detailed Action, as noted above, Lennie teaches a cookie being generated and sent to the client system, not a proxy server as in the Applicant's invention, thus teaching away from the present invention.

The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn and claims 20 and 23 which are analogous to claim 15 and recite similar limitations. The Applicant requests the withdrawal and the respective dependent claims 16-17, and 21.

Claims 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pilkington et al (hereinafter Pilkington) (WO 01/78351A2) in view of Lennie et al (hereinafter Lennie) (US 6,836,845B1), as applied to claims 15 and 19 above, and further in view of "MET Authorization for account based payment using, a SET Wallet Server" MET (MOBILE ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS) STANDARD, 'Online! 21 February 2001 (hereinafter Wallet Server). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims

The Wallet Server reference is cited for teaching a method including a payment server. However, the Wallet Server reference lacks the limitations recited in claims 15, 20 and 23, those limitations of 1) the second web server sending a message, including a cookie, to the proxy server, with the cookie comprising a network address of the second web server and 2) storing the cookie and the proxy server. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 18 and 22 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: August 15, 2007

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com